

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
MARSHALL DIVISION

HEADWATER RESEARCH LLC,	§	
	§	
<i>Plaintiff,</i>	§	
	§	
v.	§	CASE NO. 2:22-CV-00422-JRG-RSP
	§	
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., and	§	
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA, INC.,	§	
	§	
<i>Defendants.</i>	§	


**ORDER**

Defendants Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. and Samsung Electronics America, Inc. (“Defendants” or “Samsung”) previously filed a *Daubert* Motion and Motion to Strike Expert Testimony of Dr. Andreas Groehn (Dkt. No. 251) and a *Daubert* Motion and Motion to Strike Expert Testimony of Mr. David Kennedy (Dkt. No. 252). Magistrate Judge Payne entered a Memorandum Order denying the *Daubert* Motion and Motion to Strike Expert Testimony of Dr. Andreas Groehn and granting *Daubert* Motion and Motion to Strike Expert Testimony of Mr. David Kennedy to the extent of any running royalty analysis on post-trial sales but otherwise denying the motion. (Dkt. No. 434.) Defendants have filed Objections to this Memorandum Order (Dkt. No. 447), with Plaintiff having filed a Response to Defendants’ Objections. (Dkt. No. 462.)

After conducting a *de novo* review of the briefing on these motions, the Memorandum Order, and the briefing on Defendants’ Objections, the Court agrees with the reasoning provided within the Memorandum Order and concludes that the Objections fail to show that the Memorandum Order was erroneous. Consequently, the Court **OVERRULES** the Objections, **ADOPTS** the Memorandum Order, and **ORDERS** that Defendants’ *Daubert* Motion and Motion to Strike Expert Testimony of Dr. Andreas Groehn (Dkt. No. 251) is **DENIED** and that

Defendants' *Daubert* Motion and Motion to Strike Expert Testimony of Mr. David Kennedy (Dkt. No. 252) is **GRANTED** to the extent of any running royalty analysis on post-trial sales but is otherwise **DENIED**.

**So ORDERED and SIGNED this 3rd day of January, 2025.**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
RODNEY GILSTRAP  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE